



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/698,152

10/31/2003

Thomas K. Oram

12406/60

1019

26646 7590 02/25/2008

KENYON & KENYON LLP
ONE BROADWAY
NEW YORK, NY 10004

EXAMINER

KOYAMA, KUMIKO C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2887

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

02/25/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/698,152	Applicant(s) ORAM, THOMAS K.	
	Examiner KUMIKO C. KOYAMA	Art Unit 2887	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 November 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-90 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 19-68 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 and 69-90 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 31 October 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Amendment received on November 23, 2007 has been acknowledged.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-6, 10-15, 69 and 84-90 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Irwin, Jr. et al. (US 5,471,039) in view of Wilz, Sr. et al (US 6,338,454).

Re claims 1, 5, 6, 10, 12-14, 69 and 84-90: Irwin discloses a validation of a lottery ticket 50, which is a game of chance (col 27, lines 44-45). The ticket includes a bar code (col 6, lines 40-42). The external verification machine, which is a local terminal, reads the bar code, which contains the inventory control number and the encrypted validation number data (col 27, lines 52-55). The validation data contains information related to the identity of the ticket, for example, the game number, pack number and ticket number (col 31, lines 25-30). The validation number and game number is stored on the bar code 428 and the validation data is read by the external verification machine 108 (col 31, lines 29-35). The external verification machine 108 transmits the data as to which play spot areas have been removed along with the validation number to the central computer 223, which is a remote terminal (col 31, lines 35-40). The central computer 223 contains the redemption or validation file which includes information corresponding to the ticket

Art Unit: 2887

identification information for each ticket as well as a record with play indicia value data corresponding to each of the play spot areas on each ticket (col 31, lines 40-45). The central computer 223 then determines the redemption value corresponding to the matching play indicia value data and sends authorization to the external verification machine to that the redemption value can be paid (col 31, lines 50-55). The determination of the redemption value corresponding to the matching play indicia value data is a check validity program to determine whether the data is determined to be valid.

Irwin fails to teach a bar code encoded with data and a first program comprising a plurality of instructions, and sending the data based on the encoded first program. Irwin fails to teach reading a first program comprising a plurality of instructions, and executing the program, wherein executing the program includes sending the trigger.

Wilz discloses an URL-encoded bar code symbol wherein the first bar code symbol contains ASCII code elements representative of the program command (e.g., CRL(L)) that writes the URL into the information resource "Goto" window of the program, the complete URL of an Internet information resource to be accessed (e.g., <http://www.metrologic.com>), and the Internet browser program command (e.g., RTN) that executes a HTTP request on the URL entered onto the "Goto" window (col 7, lines 35-46). Such disclosure teaches a bar code encoded with data and a first program comprising a plurality of instructions. The data is the URL, and the first program comprising a plurality of instructions is the CRL(L) and the RTN. Wilz also discloses a scanning device 18, and the URL-encoded bar code symbol is automatically scanned and read when such a printed symbol is aligned with the sighting aperture (col 19, lines 60-col 20, lines 5 and col 20, lines 33-39). Such disclosure teaches reading a first program comprising a plurality

Art Unit: 2887

of instructions from the bar code, and executing the program. The program includes sending the trigger because when the RTN command is executed the HTTP request is executed.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to integrate the teachings of Wilz to the teachings of Irwin in order to quickly instigate an actions of verification without the need to go through complicated systems by directly providing instruction on the barcode that leads to the validation program.

Re claims 2 and 11: As described above, Irwin teaches that the data is a validation number, which is an identifier associated with the ticket. A validation number is an identifier because is uniquely identifies a ticket within a game (col 30, lines 62-65).

Re claim 3: As described above, Irwin discloses that the central computer 223 then determines the redemption value corresponding to the matching play indicia value data and sends authorization to the external verification machine to that the redemption value can be paid (col 31, lines 50-55).

Re claim 4: As described above, Irwin discloses that the external verification machine 108 transmits the data as to which play spot areas have been removed along with the validation number to the central computer 223, which is a remote terminal (col 31, lines 35-40). The central computer 223 then determines the redemption value corresponding to the matching play indicia value data and sends authorization to the external verification machine to that the redemption value can be paid (col 31, lines 50-55).

Re claim 15: Irwin further discloses that the bar code 80 can include information regarding the value of the play indicia 74 of the ticket 50. The bar code reader 210 communicates

Art Unit: 2887

direction with the microcontroller 224 via an ANSI standard interface, such as a UART. The bar code reader 210 is a laser scanner (col 13, lines 57-64).

3. Claims 74, 78 and 82 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Irwin in view of Wilz as applied to claims 1, 10, 69 above, and further in view of Poland (US 4,825,058). The teachings of Irwin as modified by Wilz have been discussed above.

Irwin as modified by Wilz fails to teach interpreting the first program with an interpreter.

Poland also discloses an interpreter routine that parses that input stream from the bar code scanner, checks for syntax errors and executes the memory manipulation instructions invoked, thereby loading an input value at the accessed location (col 2, lines 57-60).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to integrate the teachings of Poland to the teachings of Irwin as modified by Wilz because in order to ensure that the instructions provided by the bar code can be properly executed, which avoids any erroneous operations.

4. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Irwin in view of Wilz as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Saunders et al (US 6,340,331). The teachings of Irwin as modified by Wilz have been discussed above.

Irwin as modified by Wilz fails to teach that if the data is determined to be invalid by the check validity program, indicating that the ticket is invalid.

Saunders discloses that the microprocessor 700 waits for authorization from the gaming machine 30 or from the central computer 40 that the ticket is a correct ticket and, if correct, then delivers the cash-in value over lines 684 to the gaming machine 30 so that the player can start the game. If the amount is incorrect, then the microprocessor 700 reactivates the stepper motor 570

over lines 556 to cause it to move in the reverse direction to back the ticket out of the slot 430 and then issue a message in display 450 over lines 551 that the ticket is invalid. The microprocessor, the gaming machine 30 or the central computer 40 may issue an alarm for an attendant to visit the player at the gaming machine (col 7, lines 10-25).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to integrate the teachings of Saunders to the teachings of Irwin as modified by Wilz and issue a display message indicating that the ticket invalid so that the player is notified that the ticket cannot be redeemed and cannot receive cash, and also so that the attendant does not provide cash to the player who is not entitled to receive it.

5. Claims 8, 9, 16, 17, 18, 70 and 71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Irwin in view of Wilz as applied to claims 1 and 10 above, and further in view of Axelrod et al (US 5,337,358). The teachings of Irwin as modified by Wilz have been discussed above.

Re claims 8, 9, 16, 17, 70 and 71: Irwin as modified by Wilz fails to teach that the bar code is a two-dimensional barcode and that the two-dimensional barcode is a PDF-417 format.

Axelrod discloses a barcode being a two-dimensional barcode and the two-dimensional barcode is a PDF-417 standard barcode (col 3, lines 29-35).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to integrate the teachings of Axelrod to the teachings of Irwin as modified by Wilz because PDF-417 is capable of storing large amounts of text and data in a secure and inexpensive manner, and therefore, such barcode format is suitable for such gaming industry necessitates large amount of data to increase security.

Re claim 18: Irwin further discloses that the bar code 80 can include information regarding the value of the play indicia 74 of the ticket 50. The bar code reader 210 communicates direction with the microcontroller 224 via an ANSI standard interface, such as a UART. The bar code reader 210 is a laser scanner (col 13, lines 57-64).

6. Claims 72, 73, 75-77, 79-81 and 83 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Irwin in view of Wilz as applied to claims 1 and 10 above, and further in view of Meyer et al (US 6,915,271). The teachings of Irwin as modified by Wilz have been discussed above.

Irwin as modified by Wilz fails to teach a Java virtual machine and a compiler configured to receive and compile the instruction.

Meyer discloses a Java Virtual Machine (col 54, line 25) and a program written in the JAVA language is compiled to a bytecode file that can run wherever the JAVA platform is present (col 54, lines 19-22). Meyer also discloses that what sets the JAVA platform apart from many other common platforms is that it sits on top of other platforms (col 54, lines 15-17). The JAVA platform is ideal for the Internet, where one program should be capable of running on any computer in the world (col 54, lines 30-33).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to integrate the teachings of Meyer to the teachings of Irwin as modified by Wilz because different users can utilize one program on the internet regardless of the user's computer platform due to the fact that the implementation of the Java Virtual Machine provides the capability of running a program on any platform. Such modification eliminates the need for writing one program in different languages utilizing different platforms.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-18 and 69-90 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant has amended the claims with new limitation, such as "data and a first program comprising a plurality of." Such new limitation necessitated new search and consideration.

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KUMIKO C. KOYAMA whose telephone number is (571)272-2394. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steve Paik can be reached on 571-272-2404. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Kumiko C. Koyama/
Examiner, Art Unit 2887
February 17, 2008

/Thien M. Le/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2887